SEP 1 4 1982

ORIGINAL

Y 1.1/8:97-735

97TH CONGRESS } HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES { REPORT
2d Session } { No. 97-735

COMPLETED
6

TO ESTABLISH STATE COMMISSIONS ON TEACHER EXCELLENCE

AUGUST 12, 1982.—Referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed

---

Mr. PERKINS, from the Committee on Education and Labor, submitted the following

REPORT

together with

MINORITY VIEWS

[To accompany H.J. Res. 429]

[Including cost estimate of the Congressional Budget Office]

The Committee on Education and Labor, to whom was referred the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 429) to establish State commissions on teacher excellence, having considered the same, report favorably thereon with amendments and recommend that the joint resolution as amended do pass.

The amendments (stated in terms of the page and line numbers of the introduced resolution) are as follows:

Page 2, lines 5 and 6, strike out "and licensing" and insert in lieu thereof "licensing, and retention".

Page 2, line 14, strike out "and licensing" and insert in lieu thereof "licensing, and retention".

Page 2, line 23, strike out "public".

LEGISLATIVE HISTORY

H.J. Res. 429 was introduced on May 9, 1982 and referred to the Committee on Education and Labor, Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education. The resolution responded to the Subcommittee hearings held on September 9 and 10, 1981 and February 23, 1982 on declining test scores for education majors and problems of teacher competency and retention. The Resolution was introduced by Representative Simon and cosponsored by Representatives Weiss, Peyser and DeNardis.

89-006 O

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

Witnesses at the September 1981 hearing highlighted the problems of teacher excellence and included Assistant Secretary of Education for Elementary and Secondary Education, Vincent Reed; Acting Director of the National Institute of Education, Milton Goldberg; Deans of the Schools of Education from Michigan State University, Hampton Institute, Bank Street College, Southern Illinois University, and Texas A&M University. Other witnesses included representatives of the American Federation of Teachers, the National Education Association, current and former teachers, and the director of an alternative private school in Chicago.

At hearings on the issue of teacher excellence in February 1982, the Subcommittee heard witnesses describing exemplary programs in various states, and legislative proposals pending or enacted at the state level to encourage teacher excellence. Witnesses included the Deans of the Schools of Education at the University of Oklahoma and the University of Kansas. Representatives from California and New York testified on the problems and methods to address them in those states through certification boards and state departments of education. The Superintendent of Schools in Hartsdale, New York testified on local efforts to provide in-service training for teachers and to improve the retention rates for quality teaching professionals. Dr. Ernest Boyer of the Carnegie Foundation provided the Subcommittee with an overview on teacher quality and studies undertaken by the Foundation on problems in education.

On April 28, 1982, the Subcommittee heard its final witnesses on teacher excellence. Dr. John Slaughter, Director of the National Science Foundation, Dr. Mary Frances Berry of Howard University and G. Howard Thompson of the Illinois State Board of Education spoke on specific problems in areas such as science and mathematics training, the relationship between teacher performance and student performance and initiatives at the local level to address teacher excellence.

Witnesses supported the purpose of the Resolution unanimously. Witnesses did stress that jurisdiction was primarily at the local level and that many states had begun to examine the problems of teacher preparation, competency and retention. The National Association of States Boards of Education recommended that the Resolution not add another layer of bureaucracy at the state level. The State Department of Education of New York noted that in reviewing exemplary teacher training programs in other states, an appropriate Federal role would be to fund travel and conferences.

On June 16, 1982, the Subcommittee met and unanimously approved the Joint Resolution. The full Committee met on July 27th to consider the Resolution and it was passed unanimously.

SUBCOMMITTEE FINDINGS

Testimony presented to the Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education focused on both statistical data on teacher preparation, quality and retention, and on existing programs to address problems in the area of teaching teachers.

The National Institute of Education provided the Subcommittee with data on declines in standardized test scores for education majors

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

and correlations between high National Teacher Examination scores and low retention rates.

Over the last ten years, there has been a drop in Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) scores for freshmen entering college. While this is a decline that is reflected in all fields of concentration, those students choosing teaching as a profession have dropped disproportionately in their SAT scores. Of 19 fields of student for entering college freshmen, education was tied for 17th place in math scores and 14th place in English scores. Education majors are consistently graduating in the lower third of their classes at colleges and universities.

Further, once a teacher is actually teaching, he or she is more likely to change professions if his or her National Teacher Exam scores are high.

To summarize, high scoring students are not attracted to teaching at the preparation and training stages, and higher scoring teachers are leaving the field in disproportionate numbers.

Witnesses emphasized that there is no direct correlation between test scores and what makes a good teacher. However, it was noted that skills such as good verbal communication and knowledge of subject matter are imperative to quality teaching. While no test can measure good teaching, foundations of knowledge and communication skills can be measured, and those scores are declining.

CONGRESSIONAL INTEREST AND POLICY OBJECTIVES

The Committee recognizes local jurisdiction in the area of teacher preparation, certification and retention. Quality teaching, or its lack, has a national impact and responses to teaching problems have been made by earlier Congresses, beginning with loan forgiveness clauses in student aid programs to encourage study and teaching in particular fields and continuing through the enactment of Title V of the Higher Education Act. Title V authorized funds for the Teacher Corps and Teacher Centers and was included in the Chapter II Block Grants in the 1981 Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act.

Because of the intersection of state jurisdiction and national concern about the impact of the quality of teaching professionals, House Joint Resolution 429 calls on the states to examine the problem and recommend programs and policies to encourage excellence in teaching. The Resolution leaves to the states what form the Commission on Teacher Excellence will take in each state, as well as the composition of the various Commissions. It is expected that representatives from state departments of education, colleges, universities, local school districts and teachers themselves will be consulted. It is recognized that many states have begun studies on teacher excellence in the form of competency testing and more stringent certification procedures. These current efforts do not conflict with the intent of the Resolution. The commissions need not be new agencies with new mandates, but may draw on existing agencies with responsibility in preparation and certification, focusing on improved teacher quality and improved retention of quality teachers. The purpose of the commissions can be met by a wide variety of state agencies, commissions and boards currently in existence, or by specially appointed advisory groups.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

The reports from the commissions should be addressed to three levels of government—Federal, state and local. It is anticipated that each state commission will recommend specific measures to improve teacher quality at all levels of responsibility from colleges and universities to local schools districts to the state department of education. It is also anticipated that recommendations for a Federal role, if any, be contained in the state commission reports.

Rather than dictate policy in an area traditionally under state control, the Resolution seeks the states' assistance in determining whether there is an appropriate Federal role, and focuses attention on the problem of teacher excellence to encourage states to examine exemplary programs currently in place in some areas and draw from these programs where their procedures can be applied in other jurisdictions.

COST OF THE LEGISLATION

A. Estimate of the Congressional Budget Office

In compliance with clause 2(l)(3)(c) of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the estimate and comparison prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office pursuant to section 403 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, as timely submitted prior to the filing of this report, is set forth as follows:

U.S. CONGRESS,
CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE,
Washington, D.C., June 10, 1982.

Hon. PAUL SIMON,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Postsecondary Education, Committee on Education and Labor, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: In response to your request, CBO has examined the cost impact of H.J. Res. 429, to establish state commissions on teacher excellence. Based on our analysis there would be no increase in federal costs as a result of passage of this resolution.

H.J. Res. 429 recommends that states establish commissions to evaluate the current system for teacher preparation and to share the data collected from these evaluations with the President and Congress.

We would be glad to answer any questions you might have regarding this analysis.

Sincerely,

ALICE M. RIVLIN, *Director.*

B. Committee estimate

In compliance with clause 7(a)(1) of Rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee adopts the estimate prepared by the Director of the Congressional Budget Office.

INFLATIONARY IMPACT STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 2(l)(4), Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Subcommittee estimates that the enactment of H.J. Res. 429 will have little inflationary impact on prices and costs in the operation of the national economy. It is the judgment of the

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

Subcommittee that the inflationary impact of this legislation as a component of the total Federal budget is nil.

OVERSIGHT FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON GOVERNMENT OPERATIONS

In compliance with clause 2(l)(3)(D), of Rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee states that no findings or recommendations of the Committee on Government Operations were submitted to the Committee with reference to the subject matter specifically addressed by H.J. Res. 429.

SECTION-BY-SECTION ANALYSIS

The purpose of the Resolution is to call on states to establish State Commissions on Teacher Excellence to report to Federal, state and local governments on programs and policies to encourage the preparation and retention of quality teaching professionals.

The Resolution has four points which (1) declare that states should evaluate the training and performance requirements for teachers, (2) call on states to review exemplary programs in other jurisdictions, (3) recommend the establishment of state commissions on teacher excellence to promote evaluations of state and local programs, and (4) invites the state commissions to make their findings available not only to state and local jurisdictions, but to the Federal government.

BEST DOCUMENT AVAILABLE

MINORITY VIEWS ON H.J. RES. 429

We object to the resolution H.J. Res. 429, which expresses the sense of the Congress that States should establish state commissions on teacher excellence.

The resolution would call for the creation of a new layer of bureaucracy at the state level to study a problem that we all know exists. We all know of the problems facing teachers in the classroom, of the decline of qualified persons entering the field of teaching, of the lack of in-service training, of the low salaries, of the few incentives and awards available to keep good teachers in the schools. Recently, many states, having recognized these problems on their own, have undertaken programs to improve the training, evaluation, and certification of their teachers to ensure quality education. For instance, the State of New Jersey just instituted tougher teacher certification standards to require prospective teachers to have a major in a field other than in teaching, to spend more time in student teaching situations, and to have a minimum grade point average. The State of Virginia has just approved a plan whereby teachers-to-be would be granted a provisional certificate, then be required to take classes in teaching methodology, and to be observed and aided by experienced teachers. At the end of the two years, that prospective teacher would be evaluated and would receive certification or would leave the field.

These are not isolated cases. As of March of this year, twenty-three states, including Illinois, Delaware, Texas, Maryland, and Missouri, to name a few, have re-evaluated their teacher training and certification requirements. This is an instance where the states have dealt with a problem while the Congress has only talked about it. We should let the states get on with solving their problems, rather than have them waste more time talking about it.

The resolution also calls for the state commissions to make available recommendations to Congress and the President on ways to improve the recruitment, selection, training, certification, licensing, and retention of teachers. This presupposes that the Federal Government has, or should have, an active role in teacher education. While certainly of interest to everyone—including lawmakers—the responsibility for teacher preparation and certification belongs and always has belonged to the state and local educational entities. We do not believe that the Federal Government should begin meddling in this area of educational policy, and we see this resolution as the first step toward Federal involvement in teacher education.

For the reasons cited above, we do not support H.J. Res. 429 and will oppose it when it comes to the floor.

JOHN N. ERLENBORN,
WENDELL BAILEY,
LARRY E. CRAIG,
EUGENE JOHNSTON,
STEVE GUNDERSON.